

Application No. 10/807,586  
Amendment dated December 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 30, 2005

Docket No.: 0399-0130PUS1  
Page 7 of 11

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Two Sheets of Replacement Drawings are attached, with changes to FIGS. 1a, 1b, and 3, to properly identify first side 4a of the auxiliary door, second side 4b of the auxiliary door, horizontal arrows 3h, and vertical arrows 3v.

### **REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-6 and 8 are pending. Claims 1-6 and 8 are amended. Claim 1 is independent.

#### **Foreign Priority Claim**

The Examiner has acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority.

#### **Information Disclosure Citation**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 24, 2004, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

#### **Drawings**

The Examiner has indicated that the drawings have been accepted.

In this response, the Applicant has attached two Sheets of Replacement Drawings are attached, with changes to FIGS. 1a, 1b, and 3, to properly identify first side 4a of the auxiliary door, second side 4b of the auxiliary door, horizontal arrows 3h, and vertical arrows 3v. No new matter has been entered.

#### **Substitute Specification**

In accordance with MPEP §608.01(q), Applicant herewith submits a substitute specification in the above-identified application. Also included is a marked-up copy of the original specification which shows the portions of the original specification which are being added and deleted. Applicant respectfully submits that the substitute specification includes no

new matter and that the substitute specification includes the same changes as are indicated in the marked-up copy of the original specification showing additions and deletions.

Because the number of amendments which are being made to the original specification would render it difficult to consider the case, or to arrange the papers for printing or copying, Applicant has voluntarily submitted this substitute specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the substitute specification be entered into the application.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, the Applicant has amended claims 1-6 and 8, and cancelled claims 7, 9, and 10. In addition, the Applicant has amended the specification in order to provide proper antecedent basis in the specification for the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner will note that with the amendments to claims 1-6 and 8, and the cancellation of claims 7, 9, and 10, none of pending claims 1-6 and 8 makes any of the following elements the structure of which the Examiner alleges is not known including: "position stopper", "locking tool 20", "locking part 19", "locking tool 18", "auto-lock part 21", "controller 22", or auxiliary door that is expandable and retractable". Further, the specification has been amended to point out that FIG. 3 illustrates that moving the engagement/disengagement lever 15 in a horizontal direction (horizontal arrows 3h) will cause the support parts 8 and 9 to engage with or disengage from (vertical arrows 3v) the locking bearing parts 10 and 11 of the door opening frame 3.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, are fully supported by and adequately described in the written description of the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language lacks antecedent basis or is not clearly understood.

In order to overcome this rejection, the Applicant has amended claims 1-6 and 8 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Claims 7, 9, and 10 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

Application No. 10/807,586  
Amendment dated December 20, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 30, 2005

Docket No.: 0399-0130PUS1  
Page 11 of 11

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: December 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Substitute Specification

Two sheets of revised formal drawings (with changes to FIGS. 1a, 1b, and 3)